DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 363 926 EA 025 382

AUTHOR Goldman, Paul; Conley, David T.
TITLE Leading the Learning from Above: Articulating State School Restructuring Legislation to Districts and School Buildings.
PUB DATE 30 Oct 93
NOTE 39p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration (7th, Houston, TX, October 27-31, 1993).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; *Policy Formation; Resistance to Change; *School Restructuring; *State Legislation; *State School District Relationship; State Standards; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Participation
IDENTIFIERS *Oregon; *Oregon Education Act for the 21st Century 1991

ABSTRACT

This paper explores educator reactions to Oregon's House Bill 3565, officially the "Oregon Educational Act for the 21st Century," and describes how and why reactions differ among individuals and schools. The act differs from those enacted by other states in that it mandates changes that are not incremental and focuses on the restructuring of secondary education. The traditional 4-year high school program is divided into two performance-based programs--the Certificate of Initial Mastery (CIM) and the Certificate of Advanced Mastery (CAM). Data for this study were derived from a self-administered questionnaire that was sent to all certified staff at 92 schools in 18 Oregon school districts. A total of 2,257 out of 3,445 surveys were returned, a 66 percent response rate. Findings indicate that school-restructuring legislation can be developed without broad-based teacher participation if it responds to concerns already felt by teachers. School leadership, whether derived from principals or teacher-leaders, plays an important role in how schools respond to change. States that mandate change should be prepared to provide some of the resources, such as funding and professional support, that enable educators to make meaning at the site level and that are compatible with and supportive of school structures and strategies. State policymakers should also allow schools to design their own responses to meet externally imposed performance standards. Finally, educators are much more receptive than expected, but are also realistic. Six tables are included. (LMI)

LEADING THE LEARNING FROM ABOVE: ARTICULATING STATE SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING LEGISLATION TO DISTRICTS AND SCHOOL BUILDINGS*

PAUL GOLDMAN
DAVID T. CONLEY
ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS
EDUCATIONAL POLICY & MANAGEMENT
UNIVERSITY OF OREGON
EUGENE, OREGON 97403-1215
(503) 346-5171 (VOICE)
(503) 346-5174 (FAX)

PAPER PRESENTED AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE
UNIVERSITY COUNCIL FOR EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION,
HOUSTON, TEXAS, OCTOBER 30, 1993

Research Problem and Research Context

Can state-level legislation which mandates major alterations in educational policy cause educators to change their attitudes and behaviors sufficiently that the policy initiatives result in school restructuring? How do educators react to legislated restructuring at the school district and school building level? How are the actions of state level policy-makers communicated and interpreted by the front-line educators who must translate a broad educational vision into day-to-day instructional practice? Is the message acted upon, or even received, at the site level? How do the various groups of educators affected by the legislation make meaning out of it? In this paper we explore educator reactions to the Oregon's House Bill 3565, officially the "Oregon Educational Act for the 21st Century," known also as the "Katz bill," after its chief sponsor. We attempt here to understand how and why reactions differ from individual to individual and from school to school.

* Funding for this study provided through a Scholarly and Creative Development Award from the University of Oregon.

In 1991, the Oregon Legislature passed H.B. 3565, laying out a new vision of schooling for the state's 1,200 public elementary and secondary schools. Oregon's educators were neither prepared for, nor participated in, the development of this legislation. Instead, their attention had been focused on the state's recently enacted tax limitation measure, and its implications for education funding. Oregon's reform legislation is far reaching, encompassing policies from early childhood to post secondary education, from accountability to school governance. The Act presents a complex framework for systemic redesign of education, preschool through postsecondary. Some of the most important and potentially influential sections of the Act include the following:

- The intention of the Act is to create a "restructured educational system...to achieve the state's goals of the best educated citizens in the nation by the year 2000 and a work force equal to any in the world by the year 2010." There is an emphasis on an educated citizenry and a high-quality work force.
- The Act outlines a success-oriented educational system that begins with students who enter kindergarten ready to learn. It establishes as state policy the intention to implement "programs for early childhood education including prenatal care, parenting education, child-parent centers, and...prekindergarten programs." It sets a 1998 goal for full funding of prekindergarten programs for all eligible children.
- The use of nongraded primary classrooms, where children of several years of age are taught together, is to be explored. The emphasis is on creating success-based primary programs where failure is avoided. In combination with expanded preschool programs, the primary classroom will enhance success for essentially all children through the use of teaching and grouping strategies appropriate to the developmental level of the child, not just his or her chronological age.
- The largest changes in the structure of schooling occur at the high school level, where the traditional four-year program will be broken into two separate programs, the Certificate of Initial Mastery (CIM) and the Certificate of Advanced Mastery (CAM). Every student will have the opportunity to obtain the CIM by age sixteen or the end of 10th grade.

  To obtain a CIM a student must demonstrate "the capacity to learn, think, reason, retrieve information and work effectively alone and in groups." Additionally, students must have the "knowledge and skills to

read, write, problem solve, think critically and communicate across the disciplines, at national levels by the year 2000 and at international levels by the year 2010." Assessment must include "a series of performance-based assessments benchmarked to mastery levels at approximately grades 3, 5, 8, and 10 including but not limited to work samples, tests and portfolios...culminating in a project or exhibition that demonstrates attainment of required knowledge and skills."

- The Certificate of Advanced Mastery (CAM) leads to a college preparatory, a academic professional technical endorsement, or both, in one of six "broad occupational categories." Mastery must be demonstrated here as well through performance-based means. The requirements for the CAM must be designed to "facilitate the movement between the endorsements and shall encourage choice and mobility so as to enhance a student's opportunities to maximize exposure to the full range of educational experiences." The curriculum must include "opportunities for structured work experiences, cooperative work and study programs, on-the-job training and apprenticeship programs in addition to other subjects." The certificate must also include "a comprehensive educational component."
- The Act contains numerous provisions defining how help and assistance will be provided to students who are not succeeding in public education. Included are requirements that schools identify in the primary years students who are not succeeding and attempt alternative instructional approaches with those students, along with provisions for identifying and providing comprehensive support to at-risk students through alternative learning centers. Social service agencies are required to coordinate their services with those of the public schools, and to offer them at the site closest to the client. For students who leave school before receiving a CIM, learning centers will offer "teaching strategies, technology, and curricula that emphasize the latest research and best practice" to help them obtain their CIM.
- Enhanced public accountability for education is achieved through the Oregon Report Card, a comprehensive report on performance on a school-by-school basis, an increase in visits from external accreditation teams, local school and district self-evaluations every two years, and increased parental involvement.

- 21st Century Schools Councils are mandated by September, 1995 in every school. Teachers will form a majority. Parent and classified employees must be represented, as well. These councils have responsibilities related to school goals, measures of effective teaching and learning, and allocation of grants for staff development. These committees will oversee the development and implementation of a plan to improve professional growth and career opportunities for the school's staff, to improve the school's instructional program, and to assure the implementation of the requirements of this Act.
- The Act contains provisions for lengthening the school day to 185 days in 1996, 200 days in the year 2000, and 220 days by 2010.

Oregon's reforms are <u>not</u> incremental changes that will be implemented gradually and sequentially year by year from early childhood to secondary education. In this regard they differ fundamentally from legislation in other states. The Oregon legislation's emphasis on secondary education departs dramatically from major reform efforts elsewhere that have mandated changes in first and foremost in primary education. The best examples of those approaches are Kentucky's Education Reform Act (KERA), and British Columbia's Year 2000 program (now in a period of retrenchment). H.B. 3565's author and primary sponsor, Vera Katz, had been deeply influenced by National Center for Education and the Economy's report "America's Choice: High Skills or Low Wages"(1990) which dealt explicitly with high schools and the school to work transition. Consequently, the Act emphasizes the two performance and skill-based milestones, the CIM and the CAM. The new educational system is designed to work <u>downwards</u> as elementary and middle schools look specifically to ways in which they can adapt their programs to the requirements of the CIM and the CAM.

There is an urgency in the bill's language and it has been enhanced by the energy and actions of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, a career politician determined to use her office to move beyond educational rhetoric to changes in the classroom. Hence, Oregon would seem to provide a strong test of a state's capacity to mandate fundamental educational reform. What is not yet known is how educators make meaning of this type of reform legislation, and

whether and how their meanings become new programs and practices in school districts, buildings, and classrooms.

Conceptual Framework

In this study, we draw upon two perspectives on school reform to formulate questions about how state level policy is interpreted as it moves into practice, and to examine the issues state government faces when it attempts to bring about major change in a public school system with strong traditions of local control. First we examine the state as a stimulus for educational reform; second we consider the critical role of individual schools sites in any program of educational change. Our goal is to integrate these two approaches to provide an explanation of the change process in Oregon.

In reaction to the issues raised by *Nation at Risk*, a great deal of state-level education reform legislation was enacted during the past decade. Key questions have been raised regarding the efficacy of such legislation, as well as the broader issue of public education's ability to change rapidly. Studies of these reforms conclude that they have tended to mandate more of the same at the school site level, meaning more required courses in academic core areas (Schön, 1988) (Center for Policy Research, 1989; Fuhrman, 1988). This type of reform requires little change in fundamental practices or organizational structures.

While many educational policy scholars have posited the relative merits and potentialities of state intervention as the engine for fundamental school reform (Elmore, 1983; Elmore & McLaughlin, 1988; Firestone, Fuhrman, & Kirst, 1989; Firestone, Fuhrman, & Kirst, 1990; Firestone, Fuhrman, & Kirst, 1991; Fuhrman, Clune, & Elmore, 1991; Fuhrman & Elmore, 1990; Grossman, Kirst, & Schmidt-Posner, 1986; Smith & O'Day, 1991; Wirt & Kirst, 1989), there are few studies that systematically examine the process by which educators make meaning of reform and mediate state-level initiatives. Although many scholars and reformers believe that real restructuring can only be initiated at the state level, few have been able to examine whether such action actually lead to significant change in individual schools. Fuhrman and others have argued that there is evidence that state-level initiatives can lead to change in local districts (Fuhrman, 1993; Fuhrman, Clune, & Elmore, 1991). The question of translation to individual school sites remains unanswered. Much of what Fuhrman and others

were examining were the adaptive incremental reforms of the eighties. Larger-scale, more fundamental programs of educational restructuring remain largely unexamined, primarily because few states have yet attempted them. Mazzoni (1991) states that "...scholars have had little opportunity until recently to analyze the legislative initiation of structural reforms, because relatively few laws of this sort were enacted (Plank, 1988)." There is evidence that a number of states are considering this version of more fundamental structural reform.

A second body of research addresses how individual school sites are self-starting engines of school restructuring (Conley, 1991; Eberts, Schwartz, & Stone, 1990; Elmore, 1988; Glen & Crandall, 1988; Goldman, Dunlap, & Conley, 1991; Hallinger, Murphy, & Hausman, 1991; Radnofsky & others, 1990; Taylor & Teddlie, 1992). These researchers tends to view state intervention as a problem, nuisance or barrier to change rather than as an initiator or facilitator of it. Their studies focus on how educators at individual school sites are working to reconceptualize schooling in unique, non-standardized ways (Goldman, Dunlap, & Conley, 1993), and how educators at individual school sites are making meaning out of the restructuring movement (Conley, Dunlap, & Goldman, 1992). The data we have gathered provide us with an opportunity to examine and assess the extent to which reactions to and comprehension of a very broad statewide initiative may differ by individual, district, and school characteristics.

Data Collection and Methodology

Date reported in this paper come from a self-administered questionnaire distributed and returned during Fall 1992, approximately fifteen months after the passage of H.B. 3565. The eight-page questionnaire consisted of 99 forced-choice items, one open-ended question, a comments section, three items on personal characteristics, and five items describing the respondent's school building and school district. The forced choice items were grouped into the following areas: (1) knowledge of H.B. 3565; ((2) beliefs about the law's *intent*; (3) assessment of the law's potential *effects*; (4) predictions about the success of implementation; (5) personal reactions, including how much each respondent might have to *change*, (6) what resources would be required for the law to be implemented; and (7) whether specific provisions will improve student learning. Initial drafts of the survey were developed by the researchers based on their knowledge of H.B. 3565, their work with school districts and the Department of Education, and their

discussions with teachers and administrators in Oregon schools. The survey was pretested on Oregon educators during Summer 1992. A copy of the instrument is included in Appendix A.

Responses to the questionnaire represent a stratified sample in which the units of analysis were school districts and school buildings as well as individual educators. This strategy provided a correction factor that overcame the extreme skewness in the size of Oregon's 297 school districts, many of which are extremely small. Based on the number of students served, the state was divided into four groups of roughly equal size, plus Portland, the one large urban district. Within each of the four categories, districts were randomly selected so that each category would proportionally represent its share of the state's student population. Hence, two districts each were selected in the two largest categories, four from the medium-sized group of school districts, and nine from the smallest ones. Within each school district, individual school buildings were randomly selected as follows: one high school, two middle schools or junior highs, and three elementary schools. In districts with fewer schools, all buildings were included in the study. A total of 92 schools were included in the sample.

Table 1. Sample Description and Response Rates

District Size (ADM)	# Districts in Oregon	# Districts in Sample	ADM in Oregon	% of Oregon ADM	Surveys Distributed	Surveys Returned	% of Surveys	Return Rate
30,000 +	1	1	53,700	11.6%	225	140	9.2%	62.2%
10,400 -29,999	4	2	83,100	17.9	562	374	24.7	66.5
5,000 -10,399	15	2	113,300	24.4	504	271	18.0	53.8
2,000 - 4,999	35	4	113,700	24.5	757	478	31.7	63.1
under 2,000	242	9	100,200	21.6	390	247	16.4	63.3
State of Oregon Sample	297	18	464,000	100.0%	2438	1510	100.0%	61.9
2 Case Study Districts (5,000-10,000 ADM)					1007	747		74.2%
Total		20			3445	2257		65.6%

In each school, questionnaires were distributed to all certified staff. The principal was first approached with a request that the school participate in the study. In some cases, the request was referred to the district office. After

permission was granted, appointments were scheduled so that a member of the research staff could make a brief presentation at a faculty meeting. In some cases, the principal himself/herself requested faculty participation in a meeting or through a letter to the staff. Staff returned the anonymous completed questionnaires to a drop box in the school office, and members of the research team either picked them up or they were mailed directly to the researchers' university office.

The questionnaires were distributed, completed, and collected between October 1 and December 15, 1992. No district refused to participate, but one school did refuse and was replaced with another from the same district. Of the 3,445 questionnaires distributed, a total of 2,257 were returned, a rate of just over 66 percent. Return rates were above 60 percent for all but one of the sub-samples. The sub-sample proportions approximate the distribution of the state's teachers and schoolchildren. It is worth noting that response rates exceed by a substantial margin those from a parallel survey conducted in British Columbia during the first year of that province's mandated school reform. Researchers surveying teachers there reported an individual response rate of 30 percent (2547 distributed, 770 returned) and a school participation rate of 67 percent (Silns, 1992).

Data were keypunched, verified, and subsequently analyzed on a mainframe computer using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences program. Except where otherwise noted, statistical tabulations present data from both the eighteen randomly sampled districts and the two case study districts.

Four separate additive scales were distilled from the 99 individual questions. The scales were developed through both careful analysis of the language of individual items and through statistical analysis, specifically item correlations, factor analysis, and the SPSS scale sub-routine. The scales and the individual questionnaire items they contain are displayed in Table 2. Scales scores were derived by calculating the mean number of affirmative responses to the total number of items in each scale. Hence, scale scores, for instance those reported in Table 2, represent a percentage figure. Individuals answering less than 80 percent of the items on any scale were coded as missing for that scale. Each of the scales displays internal consistency, and this is reflected by the alpha statistic shown in Table 2.

Scale 1 is change orientation, consisting of items that suggest a general sense that schools should be changing and that H.B. 3565 provides an opportunity for change to occur. Scale 2, resistance to change, reflects both skepticism and disengagement. While negatively correlated with change orientation (r=-.31), this scale seems to measure slightly different attitudinal dimensions, reflecting doubts that changes should or can be made. Scale 3, learning outcomes, is taken directly from specific consecutive questions in section 9 of the questionnaire. These items asked educators whether, in their opinion, specific features of H.B. 3565 would lead to increased student learning. Except for the question about the extended school year, at least 59 percent of the respondents believed each of these features would lead to positive effects. Scale 4 measures anticipated changes in practices, specifically in such areas as developmentally appropriate practices, integrating curriculum, and increased teacher collegiality and cooperation. Scales 3 and 4 are strongly intercorrelated (r=.60), but appear to measure somewhat different dimensions of response to H.B. 3565. Moreover, the two correlate with somewhat different demographic variables.

Table 2. Scales and Scale Items

		percent agree	alpha
	Change Orientation		.680
Q#39	It is time for fundamental change in education	56	p<.001
Q#42	Many schools are already doing much of what H.B. 3565 mandates	30	
Q#43	Ideas make sense	33	
Q#44	Current system isn't working for many kids	59	
Q#67	See it as an opportunity to do things I've always wanted to do	27	
	Resistance to Change		.730
Q#50	Unrealistic	34	p<.001
Q#51	Not good ideas for education	10	
Q#52	Unfair to some types of student (e.g.., not everyone will be able to pass CIM)	34	
Q#54	Too much change too fast for schools	43	
Q#63	Am skeptical	53	
Q#70	Will take it seriously when it is adequately funded	65	
Q#72	Have too much else to do to give it much thought at the moment	25	
Q#84	Rewrite it to make timelines more reasonable	42	
	Learning Outcomes		.822
Q#15	3565 will benefit all students	41	p<.001

Q#16	3565 will benefit college-bound	63	
Q#17	3565 will cause more children to enter kindergarten better prepared to learn	45	
Q#25	Certificate of Initial Mastery will lead to decrease in dropouts	45	
Q#27	Alternative learning centers will help decrease dropouts	69	
Q#89	Site councils will lead to learning	69	
Q#90	Increased accountability for school sites and districts will lead to learning	67	
Q#91	Full funding for preschool programs to enable all students to enter school ready to learn	84	
Q#92	Extended school year will lead to learning	35	
Q#93	Certificate of Initial Mastery will lead to learning	66	
Q#94	Certificate of Advanced Mastery will lead to learning	65	
Q#95	Alternative learning centers will lead to learning	86	
Q#96	Parental choice for students who are not succeeding in a school will lead to learning	62	
Q#97	Coordination of social services at the school site for those who need such services will lead to learning	81	
Q#98	Mixed age classrooms in grades 1-3 will lead to learning	59	
Q#99	Educational philosophy of developmentally appropriate practices in grades 1-3 will lead to learning	80	
	Changes in Practices		.721
Q#11	3565 will promote more developmentally appropriate practice in elementary schools	66	p<.001
Q#14	3565 will increase teacher control over instructional program at school	39	
Q#18	3565 will cause teachers to increase number of instructional strategies they employ	62	
Q#19	3565 will lead to greater integration of social services in schools	61	
Q#20	3565 will lead to greater curriculum integration	74	
Q#21	3565 will lead to new and diverse ways to organize or group students for learning	77	
Q#22	3565 will lead to increased teacher involvement in decision-making	56	
Q#23	3565 will lead to increased teacher collegiality and cooperation	51	

Statistical analysis utilized the analysis of variance routines contained in the SPSS program. Statistically significant and conceptually interesting findings consisted primarily of comparisons of scale means between different values of categorical variables. Statistical significance was assessed using F-tests, and these are reported, as appropriate, in individual tables as recommended by Blalock (1972). Readers should note, however, that with large sample size,

statistical significance may be reported when actual differences are small and, conversely, the lack of statistical significance where sample means show little difference between them may indicate "non-findings" that are nonetheless suggestive or important (Cohen, 1990).

The methodology and design of this study applies a policy analysis perspective to this investigation. No formal hypothesis is posed; the results from the data analysis are not designed to provide a definitive answer to the basic questions presented at the beginning of this paper, but to describe and illustrate one dimension of the answers to the questions posed. The data suggest both the likelihood of implementing the reform program, and the potential roadblocks to implementation. Policy analysis of this sort is designed to serve an "enlightenment function" (Majchrzak, 1984; Weiss, 1977),the purpose of which is to highlight the effects, both intended and unintended, of policy as it is put into practice. Therefore, we present an analysis of the data and provide an interpretation of its meaning and implications first in a more limited statistical sense, and then in a broader policy context.

The analysis and discussion of the data suggest focal points for subsequent investigations and data collection aimed at answering the basic question posed: can states restructure schools with strong histories of local control via comprehensive legislative programs? We continue to investigate this question, and distributed the survey again in October, 1993 to a representative sub-sample of the schools in this sample. We plan to conduct interviews at selected sites to gain further insight into educator reactions. These data represent our initial analysis and conclusions, and will be elaborated over time as we gain further insight into this process of policy implementation, and as the process itself unfolds.

Results and Interpretations

In presenting the study's findings, we first lay out the highlights of the frequency distributions, summarizing previous papers (Conley, Goldman, & Dunlap, 1993a; Conley, Goldman, & Dunlap, 1993b), and setting the context for more detailed analysis. Second, we discuss and analyze the four scales in the context of individual, school, and district demographic characteristics. Third, we move from an individual to a school building level of analysis, presenting and discussing how schools seem to differ from one another.

Questionnaire responses indicate that educators believed H.B. 3565 was well intended and had student interests at heart, but fifteen months after enactment, they did not yet feel fully informed about the bill's details and its implications. A substantial majority believed that the most innovative programs, the Certificates of Initial and Advanced Mastery (88 and 86 percent respectively) would be implemented, and almost as many (82 percent) expected site-based decision making would become the norm. They were very skeptical that preschool programs and the extended school year, the most expensive components of H.B. 3565, would actually come to pass. Moreover, with virtual unanimity (92 percent), they believed that funding and time for staff development were essential prerequisites for successful implantation of the act.

Three-quarters of the respondents thought H. B. 3565 would result in new ways to group students and in greater curriculum integration, and that the new Alternative Learning Centers for failing or at-risk adolescents would decrease drop-out rates. A majority of educators believed both that the current system is not working for many kids (59 percent) and that it is time for fundamental change in education (56 percent). About half the respondents considered themselves skeptical but, at the same time 66 percent expected to make at least a "little" change and another 29 percent expected to change "a lot."

In general, Oregon's educators seem more positive about the concepts embodied in H.B. 3565 than their counterparts elsewhere (Harris and Wagner, 1993). Both the general intent of the law, and its specific elements, are apparently not in conflict with the way educators perceive both current problems and the potential solutions to them. This finding is consistent with Fuhrman and others' (1991) findings that "suggest strongly that policy maker and educator support for reform, which is key to successful implementation, does not depend on participation in reform initiation and design" (p. 215). Our findings affirmed the proposition that teachers and administrators in Oregon may be philosophically ready to address the broad restructuring implied by H.B. 3565. However, they are quite skeptical that the state will follow through with either the funding or the perseverance necessary to sustain these changes.

Individual Differences

Table 3 displays one-way analyses of variance for each of the scales as they are distributed among individual and organizational characteristics. The table is organized in three sections: characteristics of individuals, characteristics of school buildings, and characteristics of school districts. We deal with each in turn.

Table 3. Scale Means by Individual, Building, and Individual Demographics

		resistance to change	change orientation	learning outcomes	changes in practices	N
	sample mean	**37.9**	**32.5**	**63.9**	**60.7**	**2,257**
POSITION		F=29.0***	F=18.4***	F=23.5***	F=17.9***	
	teachers	40.0	31.5	62.5	58.7	1,583
	other cert.	36.1	34.8	66.7	63.7	282
	administrators	29.4	43.3	73.2	76.9	134
GENDER		F=6.76**	F=0.63	F=7.37***	22.9***	
	men	37.8	33.3	60.8	58.5	787
	women	39.5	32.5	65.9	62.4	1,178
AGE		F=2.22	F=.070	F=1.67	F=1.55	
	20-29	41.0	31.5	63.1	59.2	151
	30-39	38.8	31.9	63.3	62.2	485
	40-49	37.2	33.5	64.9	61.8	909
	50-59	38.1	33.2	64.0	58.9	413
	60+	40.0	29.6	54.4	49.4	25
YEARS EXPER.		F=1.80	F=0.11	F=1.65	F=2.06	
	1 to 5	37.9	33.1	66.2	62.1	322
	6 to 10	36.9	33.3	65.3	61.9	339
	11 to 20	39.6	32.4	63.9	61.3	737
	21 to 30	38.4	32.1	61.6	59.7	505
	30+	38.4	32.1	61 5	52.1	77
SCHOOL LEVEL		F=16.1***	F=18.8***	F=18.4***	F=0.66	
	high schools	37.1	36.5	63.1	61.0	737
	Jr hi & middle	38.4	31.7	63.3	54.0	564
	elementaries	41.5	29.1	64.3	64.8	632
PRINCIPAL		F=0.01	F=1.88	F=0.57	F=3.24	

GENDER	men principals	38.8	33.5	63.4	60.7	1,175
	women principals	38.3	32.0	65.4	61.9	708
STUDENT SES		F=1.69	F=0.83	F=1.32	F=2.74*	
	Highest quartile	38.8	32.9	62.8	62.4	476
	2nd quartile	37.0	34.1	66.1	62.6	454
	3rd quartile	38.9	31.9	62.4	58.9	475
	4th quartile	39.4	32.1	64.9	60.9	498
2020 GRANT		F=16.7***	F=15.5***	F=10.8***	F=1.17	
	Yes	36.1	31.2	63.5	59.1	673
	No	31.8	35.6	64.7	64.2	1,549
DISTRICT SIZE		F=8.08***	F=0.84	F=9.90***	F=0.17	
	15,000+	40.4	33.1	63.5	55.9	460
	5000-14999	37.9	37.7	63.7	65.7	900
	2000-4999	36.5	37.2	64.3	62.1	434
	100-1999	42.2	36.0	63.5	55.6	225
LOCALE		F=11.8***	F=9.01**	F=13.9***	F=10.3***	
	Portland Metro	37.4	30.9	62.1	55.9	933
	Willamette Valley	32.0	36.1	67.8	67.6	728
	Southern Oregon	30.2	33.4	65.2	63.0	246
	Central/Eastern	41.2	24.7	56.5	55.3	137
	Oregon Coast	33.0	31.2	61.2	59.4	210
DISTRICT $ EXPEND PER STUDENT		F=13.9***	F=13.6***	F=22.6***	F=7.66***	
	Highest quartile	38.8	30.4	63.2	60.3	477
	2nd quartile	38.3	37.1	67.0	66.0	494
	3rd quartile	35.6	34.1	64.9	65.0	509
	4th quartile	42.0	28.7	60.3	51.5	510

*** p<.001 ** p<.01 * p<.05

There are substantial differences in attitudes between classroom teachers and administrators. Each scale showed a differential of at least 10 points between the two: teachers appear to be less oriented to change generally and less likely to believe reformers' pleas that the educational system is in crisis; correspondingly

teachers are more resistant to change, at least the changes embodied by H.B. 3565. A much lower proportion of teachers believe that H.B. 3565 will either change educational practices or make significant improvements in outcomes. Certified staff who are not classroom teachers present intermediate attitudes, but specialists, counselors, and special educators seem to be more similar in outlook to teachers. A note of caution: these differences are relative: the typical teacher still thought 60 percent of the reform proposals would change practices and improve outcomes.

Comparisons between Oregon's female and male educators reveal small differentials. Women express marginally more agreement with statements that describe resistance to change, and marginally less agreement with those describing a change orientation. What makes these findings interesting is that they run in the opposite direction from the results on the outcomes and practices scales. Women are more optimistic about the possible beneficial effects of H.B. 3565 on student learning and about the likelihood that teachers will change their instructional practices. As we note below, these differences may partially be explained by differences between elementary and secondary teachers, but this is probably only part of the story. Note, however, that leadership gender shows weaker results: there are virtually no differences in the response pattern between schools with male and female principals.

Contrary to both the conventional wisdom to the recent findings released by Auriemma and others (1992) and the Canadian Teachers Federation (King & Peart, 1992), there appears to be virtually no relationship between reactions to H.B. 3565 and the individual educator's age or experience. Oregon's teaching force is predominantly middle-aged (median age is 45) and experienced. This sample seems to be a reliable approximation of the state: almost one-half are in their forties. Except for teachers in their sixties who present views less favorable to Oregon's educational reforms, no age group is noticeably more or less" change oriented" or "change resistant."

If individual responses are not correlated with personal demographic characteristics, what about school building level? As Table 2 indicates, high school and elementary school teachers do differ somewhat from one another, especially in the degree to which they embrace change. Middle school and junior high teachers are in the middle. For example, two-thirds of high school teachers

but only one-half of elementary teachers agree that "the system isn't working for many kids." Differences narrow when we consider beliefs about whether teachers will change their instructional practices and about whether this set of school reforms will improve learning outcomes. In addition, the gradation running from elementary to middle to high school breaks down when we consider how much teachers say they know about H.B. 3565 and how much they expect their own practices to change. Middle school and junior high teachers believe they are less informed than both other groups and less likely to anticipate changed practices. Here again, the Act did not specify or mandate program changes, but many are clearly implied by other sections of the Act, such as the CIM and CAM.

We investigated whether school averages on student socio-economic status might be related to how teachers view school reform. In general, schools with middle and upper middle class students in Oregon have had somewhat more resources of all kinds, while schools with students from working and lower class families contain a higher proportion of children with learning problems who may have to be educated with relatively fewer resources. Whatever the differences between these types of schools in practices, workloads, or morale, we found no differences in their faculty's beliefs about school reform. These similarities were echoed by comparisons of district-level differences in funding. In our sample, educators in the poorest districts are a bit less optimistic about H.B. 3565 and its possible effects, but their responses are more similar to those of educators in the richest districts than to those in the middle.

Geography and district size appear to explain some differences. Over 80 percent of Oregon's population is within an hour's drive of I-5, the interstate highway that bisects the state from Portland to the California border. Educators in districts on the I-5 corridor are more knowledgeable about and receptive to reform than those in less populated and more remote areas of the state. The findings for Eastern Oregon indicate that these districts are less supportive of reform, and see it as less relevant to them. The source of these differences, and whether the apparent skepticism actually results from geographic isolation, or from a real and perceived distance from state policy makers, is discussed in the conclusions section.

The data on district size reveal some differences, as well. The largest and smallest districts are very similar to one another on two of the four scales:

resistance to H.B. 3565 and the expectation that the legislation's consequences will include changed classroom practices. Teachers in the largest districts are on the lower extreme of the change orientation scale. If these results reflect a larger reality, it possibly means that large districts may have more difficulty translating broad policy initiatives, especially those originating externally, to staff in the schools, than medium sized districts, that is, those below 15,000 students.

One final factor appears to have had an impact on attitudes: educators in schools that had previous and current state-funded school improvement grants were more receptive to H.B. 3565. These staffs were also more likely to expect that the school reform legislation might have an effect on instructional practice. Between 1987 and 1983, Oregon's State Department of Education funded competitive school improvement and professional development grants. The funding, called 2020 grants after the legislative bill number, allowed schools considerable latitude, but required that the monies be managed by a committee in which teachers were in the majority. Among the wide ranged of accepted projects were those focused on assessment/evaluation, at-risk students, cooperative learning, decision-making/governance, interdisciplinary curriculum development, multicultural issues, school climate, special education, and technology (Conley, 1991). Schools having experimented already with restructuring, whether or not the projects were successful, were more favorable to reform.

Districts as the Unit of Analysis

What the data above suggest is that aside from differences related to whether respondents were teachers or administrators, demographic factors are not strong predictors of individual responses. Even where the literature suggests possible individual explanatory factors, for instance those associated with age, experience, or gender, these had little effect. Similarly, at a broader, more contextual level, district size and even the economic status of the district's students and the money the district had to spend on them similarly made little difference. We suspect that the lack of strong findings also might reflect the low variance within the sample as a whole. Oregon itself is comparatively homogeneous in its demographics, and this reinforces a more general tendency for educators with common backgrounds, training, and experience in the workplace. Goldman and others (1990) found very low variance in their study of

administrator attitudes in Oregon. However, contrary to expectations, the range of individual variance on all four scales was quite wide.

As Table 4 indicates, each of the four scales presents a range of values when the twenty district means are examined. This table reproduces in a slightly different format some of the information discussed when the data on district size, wealth, and region were analyzed. While there is a relatively broad range of values, this is a bit misleading. Most of the extreme cases represent very small districts with only one or two schools. The results suggest that district effects are very small, explaining only 3 percent of the variance in individual responses.

Table 4: Mean Scale Scores by District

	Resistance to Change	Rank	Positive Beliefs	Rank	Changed Practices	Rank	Predicted Outcomes	Rank
sample mean	**37.9**		**32.5**		**63.9**		**60.7**	
district differences	F=4.55***		F=3.65***		F=5.79***		F=3.23***	
school differences	F=2.49***		F=2.71***		F=3.18***		F=2.31***	
top quartile	13.6-28.7		38.5-55.0		70.6-88.4		69.6-93.8	
2nd quartile	29.1-35.1		33.1-38.4		62.5-69.6		64.5-69.5	
3rd quartile	35.6-40.6		27.2-33.0		52.3-62.4		57.6-64.3	
4th quartile	40.6-58.1		10.0-27.1		35.2-51.6		40.0-57.2	
Districts with 3+ schools & 1,500+ students								
District 1	**40.5** F=3.82**	17	**32.1** F=2.22	10	**59.5** F=4.61***	16	**53.9** F=1.11	13
District 2	**31.9** F=1.20	6	**37.3** F=0.31	2	**69.2** F=0.71	4	**68.2** F=0.81	3
District 3	**39.4** F=1.71	14	**26.8** F=3.64 ***	17	**61.8** F=1.06	12	**48.3** F=1.67	18
District 4	**30.9** F=1.25	5	**30.8** F=2.93*	12	**65.1** F=0.74	12	**59.5** F=0.28	9
District 5	**37.2**	12	**25.9**	18	**60.1**	13	**54.4**	12
District 6	**29.2** F=2.05	2	**36.4** F=3.23*	16	**71.0** F=8.18***	3	**73.8** F=4.05**	1
District 7	**31.9** F=0.72	7	**31.2** F=2.44*	11	**59.5** F=1.41	15	**62.6** F=3.22**	6
District 8	**39.4** F=0.36	13	**24.1** F=2.78*	19	**57.7** F=3.64*	17	**57.3** F=2.15	8

District 9	**29.3** F=0.82	**3**	**37.0** F=1.08	**3**	**65.2** F=1.22	**8**	**67.4** F=0.85	**4**
District 17	**34.6** F=2.38	**8**	**33.5** F=1.09	**8**	**62.2** F=1.20	**11**	**56.2** F=1.94	**11**
District 20	**40.4** F=2.71*	**16**	**33.2** F=5.05 ***	**9**	**66.4** F=4.04**	**7**	**60.8** F=2.91*	**8**
Districts with 2 or fewer schools & less than 1,500 students								
District 10	**17.0**	**1**	**46.7**	**1**	**76.4**	**2**	**63.4**	**5**
District 11	**47.9**	**18**	**26.9**	**16**	**52.2**	**19**	**48.4**	**17**
District 12	**48.6**	**19**	**10.0**	**20**	**50.9**	**20**	**53.1**	**14**
District 13	**50.0**	**20**	**30.0**	**14**	**93.8**	**1**	**0.0**	**20**
District 14	**35.0**	**10**	**36.0**	**6**	**59.6**	**14**	**51.9**	**15**
District 15	**34.8**	**9**	**27.6**	**15**	**66.6**	**6**	**51.1**	**16**
District 16	**40.0**	**15**	**30.0**	**13**	**56.3**	**18**	**31.3**	**19**
Case Study Districts								
District 18	**30.0** F=2.62***	**4**	**36.4** F=1.49	**4**	**66.7** F=1.71*	**5**	**68.6** F=1.71*	**2**
District 19	**35.8** F=2.17*	**11**	**34.0** F=3.95***	**7**	**63.5** F=3.97***	**10**	**60.8** F=2.21*	**7**

*** p<.001 ** p<.01 * p<.05

School Differences

When schools are taken as the unit of analysis, however, we get much stronger results. Table 4 suggests a less powerful central tendency of the district-level data. When individual school scores are examined there are some pronounced differences between the top and bottom schools on all four scales. Space limitations prevent the presentation of all 92 school scores; however, Table 5 presents results from all schools in three districts to illustrate the difference among buildings within a district.

Table 5: Examples of School Differences in Three Districts

District 9		**29.3**	**3**	**37.0**	**3**	**65.2**	**8**	**67.4**	**4**
		F=0.82		F=1.08		F=1.22		F=0.85	
High School 1	901	28.3	19	39.1	21	64.1	48	71.1	22
Middle School 1	902	31.9	32	35.2	36	69.5	24	64.1	39
Middle School 2	903	28.7	23	38.4	24	64.3	47	60.3	50
Elem. School 1	904	16.7	4	46.7	5	71.4	18	83.3	5
Elem. School 2	906	35.6	48	22.2	80	56.3	71	65.3	33
District 17		**34.6**	**8**	**33.5**	**8**	**62.2**	**11**	**56.2**	**11**
		F=2.38		F=1.09		F=1.20		F=1.94	
High School 1	1702	25.8	11	41.3	13	69.1	27	63.5	41
Middle School 1	1703	50.9	89	29.1	63	51.1	84	40.8	87
Elem. School 1	1701	30.0	26	33.3	45	69.5	25	67.1	30
Elem. School 2	1704	33.3	38	24.0	74	61.8	60	53.2	64
Elem. School 3	1705	40.0	67	40.0	17	48.9	89	50.0	72
District 19		**35.8**	**11**	**34.0**	**7**	**63.5**	**10**	**60.8**	**7**
		F=2.17*		F=3.95**		F=3.97***		F=2.21*	
High School 1	1901	35.1	46	41.0	14	56.6	38	67.5	28
High School 2	1902	29.7	25	42.2	10	67.0	35	71.3	20
Middle School 1	1903	25.7	10	30.3	54	62.9	55	64.6	36
Middle School 2	1904	40.6	70	34.9	39	64.0	49	49.6	73
Elem. School 1	1905	35.6	49	38.5	23	67.8	30	72.4	18
Elem. School 2	1906	39.3	63	28.6	64	53.6	78	53.6	61
Elem. School 3	1907	40.4	68	27.2	69	61.9	59	53.2	65
Elem. School 4	1908	40.9	71	27.9	65	67.5	34	67.4	29
Elem. School 5	1909	38.9	82	22.6	78	50.7	86	45.7	78
Elem. School 6	1910	42.1	75	22.6	79	53.0	79	41.9	86
Elem. School 7	1911	37.4	56	27.8	67	67.5	33	55.4	59

Table 6 provides an analytic strategy to address some of these issues. The table presents a series of zero-order correlation coefficients. The top figure is the sample wide correlation (n=2,257 minus missing data) between individual responses on each of the four attitude scales, and nested characteristics of each school. For instance, staff age is the mean age reported by those respondents in individual schools. The lower figure uses the school as the unit of analysis (n=92). Variables on both axes represent school means.

Table 6. Comparative Correlations

	Individual Data			
	resistance to change	change orientation	changes in practices	learning outcomes
resistance to change				
change orientation	-.31**			
changes in practices	-.43**	.44**		
learning outcomes	-.46**	.46**	.60**	
mean staff age	-.05*	.09**	.06**	.01
% women in building	-.08**	-.06**	.01	.01
building # students	-.09**	.09**	.05*	.02
principal gender	-.01	-.03	.02	.04
SES percentile	.02	-.02	-.03	.01
grants	-.09**	.08**	-.07**	.02
district # students	.06**	.02	.07**	-.02
$ per ADM	.03	-.04	-.09**	-.05
assess $ per student	-.01	.08**	.02	.02
hs/ms/el	-.12**	.13**	.05**	.02
	School Data			
	resistance to change	change orientation	changes in practices	learning outcomes
resistance to change				
change orientation	-.66**			
changes in practices	-.67**	-.69**		
learning outcomes	-.67**	.66**	.74**	
mean staff age	-.11	.27*	.05	.26*
% women in building	.19	-.13	.05	.08
building # students	-.18	.16	.02	.04
principal gender	-.11	-.01	.25*	.21
SES percentile	.02	-.03	.05	-.10
grants	-21*	.18	.09	.22*
district # students	.16	-.06	-.03	-.13
$ per ADM	.17	-.12	-.18	-.22*
assess $ per student	.06	-.06	-.10	-.13
hs/ms/el	-.15	.23*	-.04	-.07
	** p<.01	* p<.05		

Note that none of the school characteristics seem to have any predictive impact on the scales; correlations are all below .10. Gender composition, staff age and experience, school or district size, and financial differences are virtually unrelated to attitudes towards H.B. 3565 or expectations that the legislation will result in real changes. The single exception is school level and change orientation: educators in high schools seem to see changes as necessary and those in elementaries as less necessary. The four scales are related to one another, but at lower levels than when only individual data are used.

The school data display much more pronounced effects. First, intercorrelations between the scales at the school level are higher than where the individual data are compared, suggesting perhaps that in-school processes may sustain "consistency" and awareness. Schools with older staffs are most oriented to change, and it appears that this relationship is much stronger than the effects on individual attitudes.

Staff gender composition was only slightly correlated with staff means on resistance to change, change orientation, or expectations that practices would change, but was much more strongly associated with the expectation that the changes prescribed by Oregon's reform legislation would improve student outcomes. Why were schools with large proportions of women more optimistic? Whatever the reason, the statistical data compiled here suggests that these dynamics are independent of the elementary/secondary split that is highly associated with gender. Moreover, schools with women principals show a similar pattern that holds for changes in practices as well. There are also some relatively strong associations between whether or not schools had received 2020 grants over the previous five years. These buildings certainly are not the only ones that tried to become, or succeeded in becoming, involved with school restructuring prior to H.B. 3565's passage in 1991, but the grant gives some indication of at least some administrator and teacher willingness to try new approaches. While the schools with 2020 grants seemed less resistant and more open to change, and the staffs were more likely to expect positive outcomes, they differed little from other schools in their expectations that practices would change.

Conclusions and Implications

The first year of the Oregon experience suggests that legislation mandating fundamental school reform can, at the very least, cause considerable reflection and self-examination by teachers. Furthermore, the Oregon experience suggests that school restructuring legislation can be developed without broad-based participation of teachers if, and perhaps only if, it captures key themes that respond to concerns already felt by teachers, an observation consistent with the conclusions of Fuhrman and others (1991). The conventional wisdom, expressed frequently by administrators, policy-makers and policy pundits, and seemingly felt by the general public, that teachers are unresponsive to the need to change schooling may be somewhat overstated. One indication was the fact that about 55 percent of responding teachers completed an optional comments section where they identified things they personally would have to change in their teaching practice. Teachers in Oregon seem to be very ready to enter into discussions about school restructuring, and to consider changing what they do and how they do it.

Our data suggest that both researchers and policy makers must be cautious when generalizing about the relationships between age, gender, elementary/secondary distinctions, locality, and "resistance to change." Resistors and enthusiasts exist in most schools and districts, but do not seem to come disproportionately from specific demographic categories. Equally significant is the apparent potential support for large-scale change in high schools. Such change seems to include an increased emphasis on workforce preparation and to accept (or accommodate) a more visible influence on education from the business community.

The differences in reaction based on geography suggest that smaller schools in rural areas, in particular, may view reform with a cautious eye. Aside from possible staff selection factors, the smallest districts may have problems scanning externally generated initiatives because their administrative staffs are already stretched in so many directions. The problem would be exacerbated for small districts located at a distance from policy centers. People in these districts may also be more suspicious of <u>any</u> state-level initiatives that threaten their sense of local autonomy.

Lower levels of support in larger districts may be attributable to the difficulty of communication between central offices charged with interpreting state law and policy, and the numerous school sites dispersed throughout the district. Further, many large districts, including those in this sample, have a history and culture of more centralization that mitigates against individuals sites interpreting broad policy frameworks. Principals and teachers may not be as accustomed as central office staff to interpreting the political agenda surrounding legislation. Educators have been conditioned to wait to be told what to do. In such an environment change, particularly large-scale change, can be much more intimidating, as people wait to see how the change will affect them personally.

We interpret this finding to mean that in most districts the central office or superintendent has not taken the lead in creating a district-level response to the Act, and that much of the initial education regarding the Act was aimed at administrators, who indicated higher knowledge levels regarding the Act than teachers. Therefore, individual responses are based on similar information bases; what teachers read in the paper, heard from colleagues, gleaned from professional meetings, or were exposed to in their individual buildings. Few districts apparently had undertaken systematic efforts to create a common perspective toward or interpretation of the Act.

One other factor affecting some of these larger districts may have been concerns regarding decreases in funding that would result from a tax limitation measure passed shortly before, and a new funding formula passed concurrently with, H.B. 3565. These larger urban districts stood to lose considerably under these two measures in combination, and the initial implications of decreased funding were beginning to become clear near the time the survey was completed. This study did not examine the interaction between changes in school funding and educational restructuring, but we have reason to believe that there may be a strong relationship between the two. The initial reaction to funding cuts appears to be retrenchment; how can we be expected to change with less resources? Educators did not appear to perceive H.B. 3565 (at least initially) as a tool to reallocate resources or reconceptualize educational priorities. As the state's tax limitation measure and new funding formula continue to phase in, it will be very worthwhile to observe the interplay between decreasing resources and educational restructuring. Anecdotal evidence gleaned from public statements

made by superintendents from these large districts indicate they plan to use H.B. 3565 as a tool to reshape their districts. Such statements had not been made at the time of our initial survey.

Teachers express skepticism that H.B. 3565 can be implemented without additional targeted funding to support the transition process by buying time and expertise for their own training, learning, and changing. The survey results indicate that teachers will use the state's lack of financial commitment as a reason to wait before jumping onto the reform bandwagon. Should commitment to reform falter at the state level, it will be difficult to rebuild the momentum that has already developed. Oregon's educators are cognizant that fiscal issues will continue to dominate public discussion of education in the state for some time. However, the state policy making and policy implementation structures, experienced by educators as state mandates and how state officials enforce them, have not sent coherent or consistent messages to the field. Staff members are not clear about what will happen to innovative individuals and innovative schools. State bureaucracies tend to prefer standardized reforms, while contextual effects and efforts at the building level tend to create non-standardized ones.

Individual teachers do not appear to "make meaning" of policy initiatives primarily from paper documents or formal presentations, and their reactions are not easily predicted by individual characteristics such as gender or age, or even by the demography of their school buildings or districts. Rather, making meaning is a collective process rooted in the day-to-day reality of individual schools. The extent to which teachers participate in the process by which decisions are made about how restructuring is operationalized may be key in determining their acceptance of externally-designed frameworks for school organization (Conley & Goldman, in press; Merwin, 1993).

School leadership, whether derived from principals or teacher leaders, appears to be an important factor in how school staffs respond to change. Such leadership may develop or mobilize a critical mass that overcomes inertial forces. Evidence from a separate study of leadership in ten Oregon schools involved in restructuring suggests this (Conley, Goldman, & Dunlap, 1993b). Certainly this hypothesis is supported by much of the school administration literature that stresses the training leaders to be facilitators of change. Associated with the leadership issue is the possibility that some school environments, based on their

history and culture, have articulated themselves into particular orientations towards school change. The structural effects model Blau and others have proposed feeds into this hypothesis. Blau and Scott (1962) and Burawoy (1976), writing about different types of organizations, imply that workforce stability may, over time, push attitudes and understandings towards convergence.

Wheatly (1992) states that "leadership is *always* dependent on the context, but the context is established by the *relationships* we value. We cannot hope to influence any situation without respect for the complex web of people who contribute to our organizations" (pp. 144-45). Our findings support this conception of organizations. As difficult and inconvenient as it is to conceive of a public school system as thousands of individual school buildings, rather than as one integrated system, it seems necessary to begin policy development from this perspective. When such an assumption is adopted initially, the policies that result are oriented toward enabling individual school sites to make meaning of policy by interpreting the results. In fact, well-constructed policy would require that sites engage in such a process.

H.B. 3565 does not, for example, establish the performance standards for the two mastery certificates, the CIM and CAM. In 1993 the State Board of Education adopted these standards after a development process that involved a broad range of educators and citizens. There will be one set of standards statewide for each certificate. While this is an equitable and a unified systemic approach, it denies individual schools the opportunity to interpret the standards in relation to the needs of their students and the strengths of their instructional programs. If the state had established a set of core standards for the certificates, then required all schools to adopt additional standards, this might have spurred discussion and interpretation of all the standards, both state and site, in the context of the individual school. Such a process could have heightened the meaning making process and increased ownership of the certificates. The current solution runs the risk of "bureaucratizing" the standards, with ownership for them residing in the Department of Education, and nowhere else.

The change process itself generates differences between school buildings, as decisions, experiences, and outcomes create distinct sets of attitudes and educational practices (Goldman, Dunlap, & Conley, 1993). Both school history and school culture are important: previous efforts at making change including

successes and failures and the dynamics of relationships among and between the staff, the students, and the community create in each school a unique context. Resistance to and acceptance of ch ıge are more complex and subtle than demography or status suggest, and probably are as connected to contextual as to personal characteristics.

We should not overlook an additional possible source of school-by-school differences that may flow from the interaction among individual characteristics, rather than organizational effects. While demographic characteristics may not seem important when viewed in isolation, a comparatively old or young staff, or one that is predominantly male or female, may create dynamics—essentially an interaction effect—that does not occur when people express themselves individually. It is also possible that within-school similarities are reinforced by recruitment and retention practices that attempt to "fit" staff to the culture that prevails in any given school.

Acceptance of change "in theory," which we have seen in these results, is different from willingness to expend energy to create change "in practice." Inside schools buildings, administrators and fellow staff members send messages to those who lead change and to those who fight it. These come from the staff initially and then influence the staff's subsequent behaviors and attitudes. Localized attitudes about school restructuring are important because there is every indication that educational restructuring is actually a building-by-building process, not a state or even a district-level phenomenon (Goldman, Dunlap, & Conley, 1993; Louis & Miles, 1990; Murphy & Hallinger, 1993). Administrators may have the vision for change, but the more crucial issue is whether they can create or sustain staff willingness and energy for change. States that mandate change must be prepared to provide some of the resources—funding, demonstration projects, networks, consultation services—that enable educators to make meaning at the site level, and are compatible with and supportive of the structures and strategies that emerge in schools. This observation is consistent with the findings of Teddlie and Stringfield's longitudinal study of school effects (1993).

The movement toward national and state standards only sharpens the need to focus on the capacity of individual schools to meet externally imposed performance expectations. Once standards are developed, the idea is that each site

will design the response that enables its students to meet the standards. This will occur only if staff perceive themselves as being able to modify the conditions under which their students learn. Teachers are unlikely to accept responsibility and accountability for performance in relation to externally-developed standards if they perceive it to be impossible for their students to meet those standards, and they see no way to restructure learning so that the desired performance is achieved.

Educators in this study reflect this concern. They have expressed a willingness to entertain change, but indicate they do not believe they will be given the authority or resources necessary to be successful. Future policies should address not only issues of resources, as important as they are, but also issues of capacity for change and enhanced teacher efficacy. States should give considerable thought and careful attention to supporting individual school sites as they attempt to create meaning, then subsequently to design new educational responses, based on state-mandated policy frameworks.

Can states restructure education through comprehensive legislative programs, particularly when traditions of local control and school-based change are strong? Can such changes be accomplished without additional resources for educators to develop the methods and skills necessary for the new system? Is it enough to provide a vision of a new system and little else? Our data suggest that educators are much more receptive than might be expected, but that they are realists. They are unlikely to proceed too far down this path if they believe there is little likelihood they will succeed. Reform legislation has initiated a profound reexamination of current practice and has opened the door to a new vision of education. It remains unclear whether policy makers and educators are poised to walk through the door, or to close it after glimpsing what lies ahead.

References

Auriemma, Frank, Bruce Cooper, & Stuart Smith (1992). Graying Teachers: A Report on State Pension Systems and School District Early Retirement Incentives. Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management.

Blalock, Hubert (1972). Social Statistics. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Center for Policy Research (1989). The Progress of Reform: An Appraisal of State Education Initiatives. Center for Policy Research, Rutgers University, Rutgers, NJ 08901.

Cohen, Jacob (1990). Things I have Learned (So Far). American Psychologist. 45(12), 1304-12, December.

Commission on the Skills of the American Work Force (1990). America's Choice: High Skills or Low Wages! Rochester, NY: National Center on Education and the Economy.

Conley, David (1991). Lessons from Laboratories in School Restructuring and Site-Based Decision-Making: Oregon's 2020 Schools Take Control of Their Own Reform. OSSC Bulletin. 34(7), March.

Conley, David, Diane Dunlap, & Paul Goldman (1992). The "Vision Thing" and School Restructuring. OSSC Report. 32(2), 1-8, Winter.

Conley, David & Paul Goldman (in press). Ten Propositions for Facilitative Leadership. In Murphy, Joseph & Karen Seashore Louis (Eds.), Reshaping the Principalship: Insights from Transformational Reform Efforts. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Conley, David T., Paul Goldman, & Diane M. Dunlap (1993a). Radical State Legislation and School Restructuring: Oregon Educators' Reactions to the Oregon Educational Act for the 21st Century. OSSC Report. 33(3), Spring.

Conley, David T., Paul Goldman, & Diane M. Dunlap (1993b). "Radical State Legislation as a Tool for Fundamental Educational Reform and Restructuring: Reactions from the Field to Oregon's H.B. 3565." Paper

presented at the annual conference of the American Educational Research Association, Atlanta, GA, April 14.

Eberts, Randall, Ellen Schwartz, & Joe Stone (1990). School Reform, School Size, and Student Achievement. Economic Review (Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland). 26(2), Second Quarter.

Elmore, Richard (1988). Early Experience in Restructuring Schools: Voices from the Field. Washington, DC: Center for Policy Research, National Governors' Association.

Elmore, R.F. (1983). Complexity and Control: what Legislators and Administrators Can Do About Implemeting Public Policy. In Shulman, L.S. & G. Sykes (Eds.), Handbook of Teaching and Policy. New York: Longman.

Elmore, Richard F. & Milbrey W. McLaughlin (1988). Steady Work: Policy, Practice, and the Reform of American Education. Santa Monica: RAND Corporation.

Firestone, William, Susan Fuhrman, & Michael Kirst (1989). The Progress of Reform: An Appraisal of State Education Initiatives. New Brunsick, NJ: Consortium for Policy Research in Education.

Firestone, William, Susan Fuhrman, & Michael Kirst (1990). Implementation, Effects of State Education Reform in the '80's. NASSP Bulletin. , 75-84, February.

Firestone, William, Susan Fuhrman, & Michael Kirst (1991). State Educational Reform Since 1983: Appraisal and the Future. Educational Policy. 5(3), 233-250.

Fuhrman, Susan (1993). The Politics of Coherence. In Fuhrman, Susan (Eds.), Designing Coherent Policy: Improving the System. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Fuhrman, Susan, William Clune, & Richard Elmore (1991). Research on Education Reform: Lessons on the Implementation of Policy. In Odden, Allan (Eds.), Educational Policy Implementation. (197-218). Albany: SUNY Press.

Fuhrman, Susan & Richard Elmore (1990). Understanding Local Control in the Wake of State Education Reform. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis. 12(1), 82-96, Spring.

Fuhrman, Susan Others (1988). Research on Education Reform: Lessons on the Implementation of Policy. Teachers College Record. 90(2), 237-57.

Glen, Harvey & David P. Crandall (1988,). A Beginning Look at the What and How of Restructuring.

Goldman, Paul, Diane Dunlap, & David Conley (1991). "Administrative Facilitation and Site-Based School Reform Projects." Paper presented at the annual conference of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, April.

Goldman, Paul, Diane Dunlap, & David Conley (1993). Facilitative Power and Non-Standardized Solutions to School Site Restructuring. Educational Administration Quarterly. 29(1), 69-92, February.

Goldman, Paul, Ken Kempner, W.R. Powell, & Richard Schmuck (1990). "School Administrators' Leadership Impact: A View from the Field." Paper presented at the annual conference of the American, Boston, April.

Grossman, P., M. Kirst, & J. Schmidt-Posner (1986). On the Trail of the Omnibeast: Evaluating Omnibus Education Reforms in the 1980s. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis. 8(3), 253-266.

Hallinger, Philip, Joseph Murphy, & Charles Hausman (1991). "Restructuring Schools: Principals' Perceptions of Fundamental Educational Reform." Paper presented at the annual conference of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, April.

King, Alan J. C. & Marjorie Peart (1992). Teachers in Canada: Their Work and Quality of Life. Ottowa, Ontario: Canadian Teachers Federation.

Louis, Karen Seashore & Matthew Miles (1990). Improving the Urban High School: What Works and Why. New York: Teachers College Press.

Majchrzak, Ann (1984). Methods for Policy Research. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Mazzoni, Tim (1991). Analyzing State School Policymaking: An Arena Model. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis. 13(2), 115-138, Summer.

Merwin, Greta (1993) Facilitative Power: Strategy for Restructuring Educational Leadership. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon.

Murphy, Joseph & Philip Hallinger (Ed.). (1993). Restructuring Schooling: Learning from Ongoing Efforts. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Plank, D. (1988). Why School Reform Doesn't Change Schools: Political and Organizational Perspectives. In Boyd, W.L. & C.T. Kerchner (Eds.), The Politics of Excellence and Choice in Education. (143-152). London: Falmer Press.

Radnofsky, Mary L. & others (1990, April). Restructured Schools, Tracking Classroom Effects: Teachers' Perceptions.

Schön, Don A. (1988). Coaching Reflective Teaching. In Grimmett, P. & G. Erickson (Eds.), Reflection in Teacher Education. (19-29). Montreal: Teachers College Press.

Silns, Halia C. (1992). Effective Leadership for School Reform. The Alberta Journal of Educational Research. 38(4), 317-34, December.

Smith, M.S. & J. O'Day (1991). Systemic School Reform. In Fuhrman, S.H. & B. Malen (Eds.), The Politics of Curriculum and Testing: The 1990 Yearbook of the Politics of Education Association. (233-267). Philadelphia: Falmer Press.

Taylor, Dianne & Charles Teddlie (1992). "Restructuring: A View from a Reform District." Paper presented at the annual conference of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, April 23.

Teddlie, Charles & Samuel Stringfield (1993). Schools Make a Difference. New York: Teachers College Press.

Weiss, C.H. (1977). Research for Policy's Sake: The Enlightenment Function of Social Research. Policy Analysis. 3, 531-545.

Wheatley, Margaret J. (1992). Leadership and the New Science: Learning about Organization from an Orderly Universe. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Wirt, Fredrick M. & Michael W. Kirst (1989). Schools in Conflict: The Politics of Education (Second ed.). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Appendix A: Survey Instrument

This questionnaire is designed to determine your opinions regarding the Oregon Educational Act for the 21st Century, also known as "H.B. 3565" or "the Katz Bill," for its sponsor, Vera Katz.

Please answer as honestly as possible. There are no "right" answers. Generally, your first reaction will be your best one. It will take approximately 15 minutes to complete this questionnaire.

The information you provide will help researchers and policy makers consider how this piece of legislation is being perceived by those it affects. Your time in completing it is greatly appreciated. All responses will be kept anonymous.

Put a check in the box that best describes your reaction to the question.

1. How would you characterize your knowledge of H.B. 3565?	High	Medium	Low

2. What do you believe is the *intent* of H.B. 3565? Indicate whether you *agree* or *disagree* with each statement:	Agree	Disagree
Intent is to increase student success		
Intent is to restructure public education		
Intent is to get educators to talk seriously about change		
Intent is job training		
Intent is to move to learner outcomes as the way to judge schools		
Intent is to empower local school districts to make choices within a state framework of general expectations		
Intent is to increase accountability for public schools		
Intent is to enhance teacher involvement in decision-making		
Other intent:		

3. What do you think the *effect* of H.B. 3565 will be? Indicate whether you *agree* or *disagree* with each statement:	Agree	Disagree
Will promote more developmentally appropriate practice in elementary schools		
Will increase parental involvement		
Will increase business community involvement		
Will increase teacher control over instructional program at school		
Will benefit all students		
Will benefit college-bound		
Will cause more children to enter kindergarten better prepared to learn		
Will cause teachers to increase number of instructional strategies they employ		
Will lead to greater integration of social services in schools		
Will lead to greater curriculum integration		
Will lead to new and diverse ways to organize or group students for learning		
Will lead to increased teacher involvement in decision-making		
Will lead to increased teacher collegiality and cooperation		
Will lead to greater parent/student choice of the school that the student attends		
Certificate of Initial Mastery will lead to decrease in dropouts		
Certificate of Advanced Mastery will lead to greater tracking		
Alternative learning centers will help decrease dropouts		
Other effect:		

4. How likely do you think it is that H.B. 3565 will be implemented more or less as-is?	High	Medium	Low

5. How likely do you think it is that the following sections will be implemented:	High	Medium	Low
Certificate of Initial Mastery			
Certificate of Advanced Mastery			
Accountability measures (More reporting to public on achievement of school goals, student achievement)			
Extended school year			
Alternative learning centers			
Integration of social services and schools			
Site-based decision-making			
Pre-school programs for all children			
Programs of choice			

6. If you believe H.B. 3565 will be implemented, why do you think it *will be implemented* (choose all that apply):	Check here if you agree:
It is time for fundamental change in education	
Business community is demanding change in education	
Parents are demanding change in education	
Many schools are already doing much of what H.B. 3565 mandates	
Ideas make sense	
Current system isn't working for many kids	
Most parts don't require much additional funding	
Educators are dedicated to doing what's best for kids	
Other reason:	

7. If you believe H.B. 3565 will *not be implemented*, why do you think it *won't be implemented?* (choose all that apply):	Check here if you agree:
Lack of adequate funding	
Educational interest groups (for example: COSA, OEA, OSBA, others)	
Unrealistic	
Not good ideas for education	
Unfair to some types of student (for example, not everyone will be able to pass CIM)	
Slanted too much toward needs of business community	
Too much change too fast for schools	
Parents of college-bound will object to provisions of the Act	
Colleges and universities in state will object	
Difficulty for students transferring into or out of state	
Rural areas can't do much of it	
Too much of a fad, no grassroot support among educators	
Other reason:	

8. What is your *personal reaction* to H.B. 3565? (choose all that apply):	Check here if you agree:
Am basically unaware of it	
Am anticipating its implementation	
Am skeptical	
Am waiting and seeing	
Am depressed by colleagues' reactions	
Am disinterested	
See it as an opportunity to do things I've always wanted to do	
Will retire before major provisions take place	
Am planning to leave education (not retire) before major provisions take place	
Will take it seriously when it is adequately funded	
Don't see that it has any implications for me	
Have too much else to do to give it much thought at the moment	
Other reaction:	

9. If 3565 is implemented, *how much* do you believe *you would have to change* what you do and the way you do it?	A lot	A little	None

10. What do you think you would have to change?

11. For H.B. 3565 to be implemented successfully *how important* are the following:	Most important	Moderately important	Least important
Fully fund all provisions requiring extra money			
Provide time for staff development for all schools			
Make class sizes smaller			
Identify models or demonstration sites to visit			
Create accountability for doing it			
Have Legislature recommit to Act next session			
Have business community show buy-in and ownership			
Have social service agencies show buy-in and ownership			
Make more 2020-type grants available			
Rewrite it to make timelines more reasonable			

Make early retirement options available for those who want to leave teaching			
Restructure teacher (and administrator) preparation programs			
Make available to teachers more information on what the Act requires			
Make available to parents more information on changes the Act will require schools to make			

12. Do you *agree* or *disagree* that the following elements of H.B. 3565 *will lead to improved student learning* if implemented:	**Agree**	**Disagree**
Site councils		
Increased accountability for school sites and districts		
Full funding for preschool programs to enable all students to enter school ready to learn		
Extended school year		
Certificate of Initial Mastery		
Certificate of Advanced Mastery		
Alternative learning centers		
Parental choice for students who are not succeeding in a school		
Coordination of social services at the school site for those who need such services		
Mixed age classrooms in grades 1-3		
Educational philosophy in grades 1-3 that emphasizes individual development over all students achieving the same things at the same rate (developmentally appropriate practices)		

Please provide the following information about yourself:

Your position:	Classroom Teacher o	Assistant Principal o	Principal o	Counselor o
	Other certified teacher o	Certified support personnel o	Central office o	Other:
Grade level at which you work (if applicable):	High school o	Middle school o	Primary (K-3) o	Intermed. (4-6) o
	Other (specify):			
Your age:	20-24 o	25-29 o	30-34 o	35-39 o
	40-44 o	45-49 o	50-54 o	55-59 o
	60-64 o	65+ o		
Your gender:	Female o	Male o		
Years employed in education:	1-5 o	6-10 o	11-15 o	16-20 o
	21-25 o	26-30 o	30+ o	
Size of school district:	Less than 2500	250-10000	1000-25000	2500-50000
	5000-75000	7500-10,0000	10,000-15,0000	15,000-20,0000
	20,000-25,0000	25,000-30,0000	30,000+ o	
Location of district:	Portland metro o	Willamette valley o	Southern Oregon o	Central Oregon o
	Eastern Oregon o	Oregon coast o	Other: (specify)	

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. If you have any other comments, please feel free to write them below:

If you are willing to be interviewed regarding this topic, please phone 346-5077, and leave your name and phone number. You will then be contacted to set up a time and location convenient for you.